MARCH 1953
VOL. II No 2

TAXON

Official News Bulletin of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy, Edited and Published for I.A.P.T. by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht, Netherlands

Article 44 of the International Code in relation to the Algae

by

J. W. G. Lund

(Freshwater Biological Association, Ambleside, England)

Article 44 of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, 1950 (1952), states: "On and from 1 Jan. 1935, names of new taxa of recent plants, the Bacteria excepted, are considered as validly published only when they are accompanied by a Latin diagnosis".

In 1950 I proposed that for Latin be substituted, for algal taxa, two languages, one of which should be French, German or English. Acceptance of this was not considered advisable (Lanjouw 1950, pp. 106—07) and it was duly rejected at the Stockholm Congress. As the proposal stood, including that part concerning illustrations and dimensions, I now think the rejection was the best course. Nevertheless, I still consider an addition to Art. 44 is necessary for the algae, for reasons which I give below. At a meeting of phycologists held during the Stockholm Congress in 1950 it was agreed that this matter should be raised again at Paris in 1954. I hope that by then it may be possible to put forward an agreed proposal and, further, that the present article may lead to some discussion of the problem. Briefly, I would suggest that diagnoses of algal taxa be given in either Latin, French, German or English or, in addition, in any other language as well.

The object of the Code is to facilitate the progress of our science. It seems to me that it follows that the needs of minorities should receive consideration *) and that those unfamiliar with groups of plants for which recommendations are made should consider carefully the views of those who are (cf. Hustedt 1952). These may seem unnecessary remarks, yet the fact remains that the Code is largely the production of those working in museums or like institutions with plants having stems, leaves, roots and flowers or analogous organs, and which can be preserved satisfactorily on herbarium sheets or in a dried state. We owe much to those whose arduous labours have led to a generally acceptable Code and nothing I may say here should be taken as a lack of appreciation of this.

The use of Latin has the advantage that all diagnoses are made in one language and, for most plants, a more or less standardised method of description is used. The great range of structure in the algae precludes any standard method, while for the delimitation of some it is necessary to use physiological characteristics which involve techniques more or less closely akin to those used for bacteria, the diagnoses of whose taxa need not be in Latin. To make adequate diagnoses of algae it is, then, necessary to have a good knowledge of Latin and, not uncommonly, to render into it words and phrases for which there are no Latin equivalents. It is therefore perhaps not surprising that it is often impossible to obtain a clear idea of an alga from a Latin diagnosis or to distinguish it from related taxa. It would be interesting to present those who uphold the use of Latin with a selection of diagnoses and ask them to figure the algae concerned. The use of living languages in international scientific usage largely overcomes such difficulties and permits the rendering of the finer shades of meaning which may be difficult even for a Latin scholar.

*) Silva (1952) considers this would weaken the Code.

It is not uncommon, one might say it is usual, not merely for assistance to be obtained in the making of Latin diagnoses of algae but for someone other than the author to be wholly responsible. The author may be unable to tell whether or not he is publishing a good diagnosis. If he is a taxonomist he can hardly be equally incapable of reading French, German or English.

Zoologists have given up Latin diagnoses though the variety of animal taxa described each year must equal or exceed that of plants. In this connection, it is noteworthy that many algae are included both in the plant and animal kingdoms. In which, for example, do we place *Euglena* and *Astasia; Chlamydomonas* and *Polytoma; Cryptomonas* and *Chilomonas?* Do we separate the pigmented, colourless and holozoic *Gymnodium* species? If an author does not state whether an organism is a plant or an animal (and he may well consider it is wholly neither) are we to reject his name because he fails to give a Latin diagnosis? Article 6 of the Code fails to cover this for it implies that all organisms are either plants or animals. It states that if an organism is transferred from the animal to the plant kingdom its validly published name is to be accepted as botanical nomenclature in the form prescribed by the rules of botanical nomenclature. As zoologists do not need to use Latin, some unspecified person presumably has to supply such a diagnosis on transfer though this may be due to general acceptance of a view which has grown up gradually.

Bacteriologists are exempt from Article 44. This is, perhaps, as well for it may be doubted whether they would consider themselves bound by any rules made by botanists for botanists. This is, however, presumably not the reason for their exemption. It is of interest to see the application of Article 44 in relation to algae (notably coccoid forms) whose characters are largely or wholly based on cultures in specified media under specified conditions. It may be possible to invent some 'dog' Latin to cover such cases, but is this assisting the progress of our science? It is of little use having a universal language if it cannot be universally understood. The examples mentioned are taken from papers I possess and could, no doubt, be multiplied if a survey of such literature was made.

Vischer (1936) lays great emphasis on the necessity of using media containing glucose for distinguishing a genus such as *Dictyococcus* (Chlorophyceae) from *Pleurochloris* (Xanthophyceae). In his diagnoses of new taxa, he uses the word *'saccharo'*. It may be doubted whether this refers specifically to any one sugar and certainly not to glucose. This pitfall might be overcome by using words such as *glucosum, xylosum, arabinosum* etc. Chodat (1913) did not use Latin for diagnosing many of his algae grown in culture though for other algae he did. Raths (1938) used Latin but did not include any description of the type and colour of the growths formed on given media under standardised conditions, though, in the German text, she lays emphasis on these characters. The diagnoses refer mainly, sometimes wholly, to the mean and range of cellular dimensions and cellular shape. From the diagnoses alone it would be obscure in some cases at least, why some clones have and others have not been placed in different taxa (e.g. the section on *Chlorella lichina* et var.). The diagnoses are then largely of value in fulfilling the letter of the law and it is necessary to refer to the German text to obtain a satisfactory account of them. This is similar to the action of those who, in order to validate their taxa, give short Latin diagnoses "to satisfy the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature" (Fott 1948). Since it is impossible to make rules prescribing for the detailed form of a diagnosis, presumably even briefer Latin would suffice.

The unsatisfactory nature of article 44 is reflected in the fact that so many eminent phycologists and, in turn, their students, do not or have not conformed to its requirements; for example, Bourrelly, Conrad, Fritsch, Hustedt, Iyengar, Kolbe, Korschikov, Manguin, Pascher, Pringsheim and, according to Silva (1952), Kylin and G. M. Smith. Are we to suggest that re-diagnosis of their taxa in Latin would be other than a waste of time and paper? Equally, is it likely that they are merely botanical anarchists or that they do not care about the progress of our science as much as those who do use Latin? I suggest that the very fact that they act so is a clear indication of how strongly they feel that Latin is an unsatisfactory language for describing the algae concerned. It does not appear that most of them have published their views. However, Kolbe (1948) says: — "The editor of this journal calls my attention to the fact that, acording to the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature, all diagnoses must be published in Latin. Detailed Latin diagnoses (and only such have any value) are difficult to obtain and then only with sacrifices. Because, in addition to that, in most cases, the interested reader prefers diagnoses in a living language,

I choose here to dispense with Latin diagnoses". Hustedt (1952), after diagnosing hundreds of new taxa in German, says: — "As concerns the diagnoses of new species, I changed over to Latin diagnoses in part 2 of this series. I am, however, fundamentally of the view that article 38 (now art. 44) of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature should be erased, at least for unicellular plants. Instead of Latin diagnoses, the sole stipulation which must be required is unobjectionable figures; if a new species is to be recognisable. The decision over such questions should be left to investigators who, for a decade, have worked with these organisms. However, no debate on these matters is permitted by botanists who have never had anything to do with them. In genera rich in species Latin diagnoses tell nothing, good figures everything. The zoological rules of nomenclature do not demand Latin diagnoses, although the descriptions there are really mostly more complicated and good figures much more difficult to make. However that which is possible in Zoology should not be impossible in Botany. I see myself compelled to give Latin diagnoses to prevent anyone, to whom a slavish devotion to out-of-date nomenclatural rules appears to be the final aim of botanical science, from declaring my new species to be "not valid" (sic). I declare, however, that I also in the future will recognise every species without reference to the language in which publication takes place, with the assumption that the description is accompanied by unobjectionable figures".

Hustedt raises here the question of illustrations. It seems to me now that it is difficult to make a rule as to their form since it involves defining what is 'unobjectionable' or 'adequate' (Lund, 1950). The same applies to the words 'pertinent dimensions' I used in my proposal at Stockholm. These matters might, however, be covered by a recommendation, though one may remember that it is equaliy impossible to define what is an adequate diagnosis.

References

Chodat, R. (1913). Monographie d'algues en culture pure. *Matér. Flore cryptogam. Suisse.* **4**. Fasc 2. Berne.

Fott, B. (1948). Taxonomical studies on Chlorococcales II. *Studia Bot. Čech.* **9**: 6—17.

Hustedt, F. (1952). Neue und wenig bekannte Diatomeen III. Phylogenetische Variationen bei den rhaphidioiden Diatomeen. *Ber. dtsch. bot. Ges.* **65**: 133—44.

Kolbe, W. (1948). Einige bemerkenswerte Diatomeen aus Schwedischen Gewässern. *Svensk bot. Tidskr.* **42**: 457—66.

Lanjouw, J. (1950). Synopsis of proposals concerning the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature. Utrecht.

Lund, J. W. G. (1950). An alternative to Latin diagnoses. *Nature. Lond.* **165**: 454.

Raths, H. (1938). Experimentelle Untersuchungen mit Flechtengonidien aus der Familie der Caliciaceen. *Schweiz. bot. Ges.* **48**: 329—416.

Silva (1952). A review of nomenclatural conservation in the algae from the point of view of the type method. *Univ. Calif. Publ. Bot.* **25**: 241—324.

Vischer, W. (1936) Über Heterokonten und Heterokonten-ähnliche Grünalgen. *Schweiz. bot. Ges.* **45**: 372—410.

ROBERT PILGER

Nachruf von

H. Melchior (Berlin-Dahlem)

Seinen vielen Freunden in Deutschland und im Ausland wird die Nachricht von dem Tode von Prof. Dr Robert Pilger überraschend gekommen sein. Stand er doch mit vielen von ihnen in ständigem Briefwechsel. Er war trotz seiner 76 Jahre bis zum letzten Atemzug von einer bewundernswerten geistigen Frische und Beweglichkeit, sodass wir von ihm noch vielfache Unterstützung und den Abschluss seiner wissenschaftlichen Lebensarbeit, der Gesamtdarstellung der Gramineen, erhoffen konnten. Ein plötzlicher Herzschlag jedoch setzte am 9. Januar 1953 seinem schaffensreichen Leben im Dienste der Botanischen Wisschenschaft ein Ende.

Das Botanische Museum Berlin-Dahlem verliert in Pilger nicht nur den früheren Direktor, sondern den Mann, der die Tradition A. Engler — L. Diels verkörperte und

der diesem Institut ein halbes Jahrhundert hindurch in einer vorbildlichen selbstlosen Hingabe gedient hat. Pilger gebührt an dem Aufschwung, den das Botanische Museum unter der Leitung von Engler und Diels genommen hat, ein wesentlicher Anteil!

Die Botanische Wissenschaft aber verliert in Robert Pilger einen hervorragenden, kenntnisreichen und vielseitigen Systematiker, einen ausgezeichneten Morphologen und einen allseitig hochangesehenen Gelehrten. Der beste Beweis für die Wertschätzung Pilger's als Forscher und als Mensch ist wohl die Tatsache, dass er 1950 zum Ehrenpräsidenten des VII. Internationalen Botaniker Kongresses Stockholm ernannt wurde.

Robert Pilger wurde am 3. Juli 1876 auf Helgoland geboren. Nach dem Studium der Naturwissenschaften in Berlin und Genf promovierte er 1898 in Berlin mit seiner Dissertation: Vergleichende Anatomie der Gattung Plantago. Auf Veranlassung Engler's nahm er dann von Ende 1898 bis Januar 1900 als Botaniker an der ethnographischen Expedition des Dr Hermann Meyer (Leipzig) nach Mattogrosso in das Gebiet des Xingú teil. Die botanischen Ergebnisse dieser Tropenreise publizierte er 1901 in Engl. Bot. Jahrb. Bd. 30.

Nach seiner Rückkehr aus Brasilien trat Pilger als Assistent unter A. Engler am Botanischen Garten und Museum ein, an dem er seitdem ununterbrochen tätig gewesen ist und dem er in guten und schweren Zeiten seine ganze Arbeitskraft gewidmet hat. 1908 wurde er Kustos und 1921 Zweiter Direktor.

Vom Dezember 1934 bis Januar 1935 konnte Pilger noch einmal eine kürzere Reise nach Brasilien unternehmen, als er auf Einladung der Brasilianischen Regierung an der feierlichen Enthüllung des Denkmals für Martius, Eichler und Urban, der Herausgeber der Flora Brasiliensis, in Rio de Janeiro teilnahm. Hierbei wurde Pilger mit dem Orden Cruzeiro do Sul ausgezeichnet. Dank des Entgegenkommens des Landwirtschaftministers bot sich Pilger anschliessend Gelegenheit, die dortigen botanischen Institute und Gärten kennen zu lernen und unter der Führung von A. C. Brade eine Reise nach Sao Paulo und in die Bergwelt des Itatiaya zu unternehmen.

Nach der Zerstörung des Botanischen Museums in der Nacht von 1. zum 2. März 1943 und nach dem Tode von L. Diels übernahm Pilger, der damals schon im 70. Lebensjahre stand unter den schwierigsten Verhältnissen die Direktion des Botanischen Gartens und Museums in Berlin-Dahlem. Er erwarb sich hier besondere Verdienste um die Wiederaufrichtung des Instituts, seiner wissenschaftlichen Sammlungen und Bibliothek und die Wiederherstellung des durch den Krieg stark mitgenommenen Gartens. Es war eine Aufgabe, die eigentlich über die Kraft Pilger's ging. Aber er meisterte sie, indem er Schritt für Schritt den Wiederaufbau durchführte und indem er die Verbindungen, die zum Ausland bestanden hatten, dank seiner persönlichen Freundschaften und wissenschaftlichen Beziehungen wieder aufnahm.

Pilger war ein echter Schüler A. Engler's. In seiner wissenschaftlichen Tätigkeit zeigte er eine grosse Vielseitigkeit und erstaunliche Produktivität, aber trotzdem äusserste Genauigkeit und kritische Durchdringung des Stoffes. Der wesentliche Teil seiner Lebensarbeit galt den Gymnospermen und Gramineen, die ihn nicht nur wegen ihres Interesses für die Systematik fesselten, sondern auch besonders wegen ihrer Bedeutung für die Allgemeine Morphologie und die Phylogenie, deren Problemen er stets seine Aufmerksamkeit zuwandte. Pilger war kein Freund von Spekulationen, sondern er basierte seine Schlüsse auf den Tatsachen, die er selbst beobachten konnte. In der vergleichenden Morphologie und der Typenlehre sah er stets die Grundlage für die Systembildung.

Durch viele inhaltsreiche Einzelarbeiten konnte Pilger die Kenntnis der genannten Pflanzengruppen in hohem Masse fördern und bald wurde er ein international anerkannter Grasspezialist. Schon 1903 veröffentlichte er im „Pflanzenreich" seine grundlegende Monographie der Taxaceae. In der 2. Auflage der „Natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien" gab er 1926 eine zusammenfassende Bearbeitung der Gymnospermae und 1940 den ersten Teil der Gesamtdarstellung der Gramineae, die Panicoideae, heraus. Der zweite Teil, der im Kriege z.T. verbrannte, konnte von Pilger wieder ergänzt werden, sodass dieses umfangreiche Werk, das für weite Kreise von grösstem Wert sein dürfte, nahezu druckfertig vorliegt. Mit der Drucklegung in zwei Teilbänden ist bald zu rechnen.

In der 2. Auflage der Nat. Pflanzenfam. bearbeitete Pilger ferner 1925 die Caryocaraceae, Bixaceae und Cochlospermaceae, 1930 die Thurniaceae und Rapateaceae, 1935 die Santalaceae. Und 1937 konnte er seine umfassende Monographie der Plantaginaceae abschliessen, der Familie, die ihn seit seiner Dissertation beschäftigte. Daneben waren es vor allem die Convolvulaceae, Vochysiaceae und Chrysobalanoideae, über die Arbeiten von seiner Seite vorliegen.

Auch auf dem Gebiet der Meeresalgen hat Pilger seit 1907 nach seinem Aufenthalt an der Biologischen Station in Rovigno gearbeitet. So liegen eine ganze Reihe wertvoller Arbeiten vor über die Corallineae, die Meeresalgen von Kamerun, die Meeresalgen von Annobon, etc. 1917 veröffentlichte er in Lindau's Kryptogamenflora den Band Meeresalgen, eine Aufgabe, der er sich mit grosser Geschicklichkeit unterzog. Nach dem Tode Lindau's übernahm Pilger die Weiterführung dieser Flora.

Pilger war Herausgeber der Hedwigia (1921—1932) und seit 1945 der Botanischen Jahrbücher für Systematik und Pflanzengeographie sowie der Bibliotheca Botanica.

Auch als Hochschullehrer hat Pilger eine vielseitige Tätigkeit entfaltet. Von 1907 bis 1939 war er an der Technischen Hochschule zu Berlin-Charlottenburg Dozent für Allgemeine und Angewandte Botanik. 1908 habilitierte er sich an der Universität Berlin und wurde hier später Professor. 1949 ernannte ihn die Freie Universität Berlin zum Honorarprofessor, an der er bis zuletzt über Systematik und Morphologie las.

Pilger war ein Systematiker im besten Sinne des Wortes, der sich nicht in Einzelheiten erschöpfte, sondern stets die grossen Zusammenhänge in den Vordergrund stellte. Doch hatte er, wie seine Monographie der Plantaginaceae zeigt, auch die Fähigkeit, bis ins Kleinste vorzudringen. Für seine Arbeiten ist charakteristisch die schnelle und ausgezeichnete Beobachtungsgabe, die Genauigkeit seiner Untersuchungen auch bei kleinsten und schwierigen Objekten und die absolute Zuverlässigkeit seiner Angaben.

Pilger war ein aufrechter, untadeliger Charakter. Seinem Wesen nach eine äusserst bescheidene, ja, zurückhaltende Natur, die stets die Sache, nie seine Person in den Vordergrund stellte und nie persönliche Vorteile suchte. Seinen Mitarbeitern und Schülern stand er jederzeit mit Rat und mit der Tat zur Seite. Kennzeichnend für ihn ist sein ausgesprochenes Pflichtbewusstsein und die ruhige sachliche Art im persönlichen Umgang.

Der Name Robert Pilger hat einen guten Klang und wird unvergessen bleiben!

EBERHARD ULBRICH

Nachruf von

J. Mildbread (Berlin-Dahlem)

Das Botanische Museum in Berlin-Dahlem hat einen schweren Verlust erlitten durch den Tod von Professor Dr E. Ulbrich, der am 4. Nov. 1952 einem Leberleiden erlag, das ihn lange gequält hatte. Er war ein sehr kenntnisreicher Botaniker, der auf verschiedenen Gebieten seiner Wissenschaft erfolgreich tätig war.

Eberhard Ulbrich wurde am 17. September 1879 in Berlin geboren als Sohn des Oberlehrers und späteren Gymnasialdirektors Oskar Ulbrich. Er studierte an der Universität Berlin besonders bei Engler und wurde am 28. Oktober 1905 auf Grund einer Abhandlung über die systematische Gliederung und geographische Verbreitung der Gattung Anemone L. zum Dr phil. promoviert. Schon lange vor seiner Promotion, seit dem 1. September 1900, betätigte er sich als Hilfsassistent am Botanischen Museum, damals noch in Berlin-Schöneberg.

Am 1. Oktober 1908 wurde er Assistent, am 1. Oktober 1920 Kustos und 6 Jahre später erhielt er den Titel Kustos und Professor. 1938 wurde ihm die Leitung der neu errichteten Hauptpilzstelle übertragen. Im Herbar hat er sich sehr erfolgreich betätigt, Ordnungsliebe und peinliche Genauigkeit liessen ihn für solche Arbeiten prädestiniert erscheinen. Er führte die Kennzeichnung der Herkunft der Pflanzen auf den Herbarbögen und den Mappenschildern durch kleine farbige Zettel ein. Die bei der Tätigkeit für das Museum gesammelten Erfahrungen legte er nieder in dem Buch: Präparations-, Konservierungs- und Frischhaltungsmethoden für pflanzliche Organismen u.s.w. im Handbuch der biologischen Arbeitsmethoden von Abderhalden 1924.

Die Phanerogamen-Familien, mit denen er sich besonders beschäftigte, waren Ranunculaceae und Malvaceae, später auch die Chenopodiaceae, die er für die 2. Auflage der Natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien (1920) in vorbildlicher Weise bearbeitete.

Er war aber nicht nur Herbariologe, es trieb ihn immer wieder ins Freie, um das Leben der heimatlichen Pflanzenwelt an ihren natürlichen Standorten zu studieren. Ein schöner Ertrag solcher Studien ist die

Monographie des Plagefenns bei Chorin (1912), in der er weitgehend soziologische und ökologische Probleme berücksichtigte zu einer Zeit, als das Interesse an der heimischen Pflanzenwelt sich vielfach noch in seiner Standortsfloristik erschöpfte. Aber auch anderen Gebieten wandte er seine Aufmerksamkeit zu, so in den beiden Abhandlungen „Deutsche Myrmekochoren" (1919) und „Biologie der Früchte und Samen, Karpobiologie" (1928).

Charakteristisch für Ulbrich war es, dass er nicht den l'art pour l'art Standpunkt in der Wissenschaft teilte, sondern auf weitere Kreise zu wirken suchte und gern Fragen der angewandten Botanik behandelte, so in der Monographie: „Der Besenginster — Naturschätze der Heimat" (1920) und „Die Korbweiden und andere Stammpflanzen der Rohstoffe des Korb- und Flechtwarengewerbes" (1949).

Später wandte Ulbrich sein Interesse immer ausschliesslicher den Pilzen zu. Auch hier war es besonders das Gebiet der angewandten Mykologie, auf dem er eine segenreiche Tätigkeit entfaltete. Als Leiter der „Hauptpilzstelle am Botanischen Museum" bestimmte er mit nie versagender Geduld die Pilze, die ihm die Berliner und noch mehr die Berlinerinnen brachten. Namentlich in jenen schweren Zeiten, als die Ernährungslage Berlins kritisch war, konnte er sich der vielen Besucher kaum erwehren. Aber auch wissenschaftlich interessierte Pilzfreunde aus ganz Deutschland und über die Grenzen Deutschlands hinaus holten oft seinen Rat ein. Oft wurde er in Vergiftungsfällen als Gutachter herangezogen. In Hausschwammfragen war er eine anerkannte Autorität, sein Urteil war oft für gerichtliche Entscheidungen massgebend. Über essbare und schädliche Pilze sowie über den Hausschwamm hat er zahlreiche Arbeiten veröffentlicht.

Ulbrich war auch ein ausgezeichneter Lehrer, dem es Bedürfnis war, sein Wissen anderen mitzuteilen. An Volkshochschulen und in Fortbildungskursen für Lehrer entfaltete er eine sehr erfolgreiche Tätigkeit. Besonders beliebt waren seine Exkursionen in die nähere und weitere Umgebung Berlins. Seine zahlreichen Hörer hingen sehr an ihm und waren ihm in treuer Gefolgschaft verbunden; sie empfanden es dankbar, dass Ihnen solide Kenntnisse vermittelt wurden und nicht nur eine oberflächliche „Popularisierung" der Wissenschaft.

An äusseren Ereignissen war Ulbrichs Leben arm, um so reicher war es an Arbeit und Leistung. Sein Fleiss und seine Arbeitskraft waren bewundernswert, seine Gewissenhaftigkeit vorbildlich, sein Wissen vielseitig. Und immer war er bereit, mit seinen Kenntnissen zu helfen, wo er nur konnte. Sein Tod hat eine Lücke gerissen, die sich so bald nicht schliessen wird.

PROPOSALS FOR NOMINA GENERICA CONSERVANDA

by

A. C. Smith (Washington D.C.)

In the first number of Taxon (1951) Drs. Sprague and Fosberg presented excellent suggestions for the selecting of generic names for conservation. No doubt these suggestions have been followed by members of the various committees now considering proposals for conserved generic names presented at the Stockholm Congress. In the past, such proposals have been presented to Congresses in very diverse forms, and I should like to suggest that standardization is highly desirable. The committees concerned are often hampered in their work by inadequate presentation of such proposals, and it would seem that each individual who suggests a generic name for conservation should feel responsible for the adequacy of his proposal.

It is to be assumed that future proposals of *nomina generica conservanda* will be made to Congresses through the General Committee of Botanical Nomenclature (cf. Taxon **1**: 9. 1951). This committee will presumably receive all proposals, list them in a Synopsis of Proposals, and finally submit them to the various special committees for consideration. It is suggested that the General Committee set up and publicize definite rules for the proposal of *nomina generica conservanda*. The following points would seem fundamental parts of such rules:

1. All proposals for the conservation of names of genera and taxa of higher rank must be in the hands of the General Committee of Botanical Nomenclature one full year in advance of the opening date of the International Botanical Congress for which the proposals are intended.

2. Of each proposal, 50 copies must be submitted. These copies may be reprints of published articles, privately printed papers, or stencilled (mimeographed) papers.

3. Each proposal must clearly and in detail state the case for and against conservation, giving references to all pertinent literature.

The above rules can be amplified, but the basic points to be kept in mind by proposers are here stated. The General Committee should firmly refuse to consider any proposals that are not submitted before an established and publicized deadline; proposals made verbally to a Congress must absolutely not be considered at that time; proposals for which fewer than 50 duplicate copies are presented should not be considered (this to dispose of suggestions made by type-script, for which 50 *exact* duplicates can hardly be prepared); and mere listing of the names concerned, without full documentation, should not qualify a proposal for consideration.

It may be remarked that, of the 117 proposals for modification of the rules listed in the Synopsis of Proposals (1950), pp. xiii — xvi, 26 are listed as "type-script". Some of these proposals involved the conservation of generic names, and these parts had to be copied for the benefit of special committees, or else the original typescript had to be sent. Other proposals were submitted with so few duplicate copies that the supply was depleted even before all members of the interested special committee could be supplied. Therefore I feel that strict enforcement of the second point made above should be willingly agreed to by all taxonomists.

Some few of the proposals now in the hands of committees are quite inadequate, consisting merely of a listing of the names concerned, with or without references to previously published discussions. I believe that the committees are justified in summarily rejecting such proposals, and it will be better if in the future the General Committee intercepts them and omits them from such works as the Synopsis of Proposals. The set of regulations prepared by Dr Sprague (Taxon **1**: 14. 1951) can well be taken as a standard for judging the adequacy of a proposal.

To summarize, it may be assumed that all conscientious taxonomists who, in the course of their researches, discover names that they believe worthy of conservation wish to present these names to an International Congress and to the appropriate committee in an adequate and courteous manner. It will be of the greatest assistance, therefore, if the General Committee of Botanical Nomenclature will present, in the pages of Taxon, a set of rules for the submission of proposals that may be thoroughly publicized and rigidly followed.

The Tristan Herbarium in Orléans

by

G. Souilijaert (Orléans) and F. A. Stafleu (Utrecht)

In his "Musée Botanique de M. Benjamin Delessert" Lasègue states (p. 557): "M. le Comte de Tristan, à Orléans, possède des échantillons des plantes recueillis par *Aublet* à la Guyane Française". This collection has for long been puzzling workers on the Guiana flora and especially Lanjouw and Uittien *) who made a special study of the fate of the Aublet collections. The authors had the good luck to discover the extremely important Denaiffe herbarium which had formerly been the herbarium of Jean Jacques Rousseau. The Aubletian plants contained in this herbarium are of great importance for the study of the flora of Guiana, since many of them are holotypes **). It was, however, evident that this set of plants was not identical with the one mentioned by Lasègue and the whereabouts of the Tristan plants remained unknown.

The second author found, among the collection of manuscripts of the Laboratoire de Phanérogamie of the Paris Museum, a list entitled: *"Liste de plantes de la Guyane,*

*) J. Lanjouw & H. Uittien, Un nouvel herbier de Fusée Aublet découvert en France, Rec. Trav. Bot. Néerl. **37**: 133—170. 1940; also in Med. Bot. Mus. Utr. **75**: 133—170. 1940.

**) It is a happy circumstance that the Denaiffe collections will, within short, pass to the Laboratoire de Phanérogamie of the Paris Museum.

rapportées par F. Aublet, conservées dans l'herbier de M. de Tristan à Orléans". In this manuscript some plants are listed under the names given by Aublet. The handwriting is undoubtedly that of Jules de Tristan, letters of whom are preserved in Paris. At the suggestion of M. Léandri of the Paris Museum contact was established between the present authors, the first of whom, being a member of the Société Botanique de France, is especially interested in the history of botany in and around Orléans. M. Souilijaert spoke to the descendants of Jules de Tristan and by actively searching the archives of the town of Orléans he discovered that this botanist was an administrator of the Jardin Botanique at Orléans for about thirty years in the first half of the nineteenth century. A further search revealed the presence of a large herbarium stowed away in one of the buildings of this same botanical garden, covered with an immense amount of dust, and apparently entirely forgotten by botanists. The authors together examined some of the plants and they succeeded in finding a few of the specimens mentioned in the list of the Paris Muséum.

This, together with administrative data on the activities of Jules de Tristan, makes it highly probable that the original Tristan herbarium has been rediscovered. The herbarium, as found in the Jardin Botanique at Orléans, consists of a) about 100 packets, each containing about 100 plants and b) a large amount of unpacked dried plants preserved in ordinary herbarium covers but piled irregularly on some shelves. The room in which the collections are housed is at the moment in use as a lumber-room. The plants are in excellent condition: the thick layer of dust may have helped to achieve this happy result. A manuscript catalogue of the herbarum exists, but it is hardly possible to find specified plants: the numbered labels of the packets have nearly entirely disintegrated and the plants are listed under those numbers. The collection includes plants from all over the world: Cape of Good Hope, Brazil, Guiana, Trinidad, West Indies, North America, Asia minor, etc. It is, however, unfortunate, that many plants bear only a label written by Jules de Tristan himself (this has to be checked), while only a few plants bear in addition a seemingly original label. The plants from French Guiana, corresponding with the above-mentioned list, sometimes bear a second label in a different handwriting which might be that of Aublet. The circumstances under which the plants are now preserved are of course far from ideal and at the moment it is almost impossible to consult the collections. It is hoped that more suitable surroundings will be found within a short time; it will then be possible to check whether the Aublet set of plants is still complete and whether any other ancient collections of importance are included.

The Comte*) Jules Marie Claude de Tristan lived from 26 April 1776 until 24 Jan. 1861 in and near Orléans. His father was a "maire" of Orléans up to the Revolution, and the family lived alternately in the town and in the Château de l'Emérillon at Cléry St André some 15 miles from Orléans. The family is still living at Emérillon, and the present M. de Tristan and his mother very courteously gave every facility to find details on the work of Jules de Tristan. At the "Château" a second, much smaller, herbarium is preserved, also from the hand of Jules de Tristan, containing plants from the immediate surroundings (Dept. Loiret).

After his retirement from the "Jardin Botanique", Jules de Tristan evidently restricted himself to the study of the natural history (in its widest sense) of his own region. A great many manuscripts are found in the Tristan archives, often beautifully illustrated and covering an astonishing variety of subjects (wood-anatomy, pollen-morphology, flower-biology, meteorological observations, etc.).

He was, moreover, a prolific writer for the press, publishing mainly in local periodicals and journals or privately printing short treatises (Pritzel mentions four publications of this latter category). He had contacts with many botanists and especially with Antoine-Laurent de Jussieu from whom he may have received duplicates for his herbarium. The Aublet plants came not directly from Aublet — who died in 1778 — but via a certain M. Hericart of whom no particulars are known at present.

As far as can be seen at the moment, the collection of Aublet plants in the Tristan herbarium cannot be compared with that in the Denaiffe herbarium. The latter is undoubtedly a "first set", containing many plants used for the drawings in Aublet's "Plantes de la Guiane Française", and bearing original labels with full determinations written by Aublet himself. The Tristan set is at present incompletely known, but the few plants which

*) Not Marquis, as Pritzel (Thesaurus p. 324) states.

were seen bear no complete identifications written by Aublet. However, it will still be of importance to study the collections; all Aublet plants are of great interest for our knowledge of the Guiana flora. A study of the handwritings may, moreover, reveal the presence of other interesting collections. It is therefore to be hoped that suitable accommodation will indeed be found so that the Tristan herbarium may be put at the disposal of present-day taxonomy.

In conclusion the second author wishes to acknowledge gratefully the financial support given to him by the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique on the suggestion of the Netherlands Organization of Pure Research (Z.W.O.).

CAPITALIZATION OR DECAPITALIZATION ENCORE UNE FOIS!

by

Nicolas Polunin (Cambridge, Mass.)

In Taxon **1** (7): 113. September 1952 there is published "a proposal for a decisive action one way or the other on the small but troublesome question of whether or not any epithets of specific or lower rank are to be begun with initial capitals." The proposer concludes "It is recommended strongly that one or the other [alternative] be adopted as an article, not as a recommendation, in order that there may be a clear and definite settlement of the question involved."

The present writer, and colleagues with whom he has conferred, doubts very much whether even designation as a *rule* would settle this most tiresome little question which has probably wasted more good, and often eminent, botanical breath and ink than any other, at least of such piffling proportions. It has been debated *ad nauseam* on numerous public occasions, including international congresses at which it has used up much valuable time and frayed many tempers, often with such heated harangueing and ademant expressions of conviction and defiant intention on either side, that it seems quite clear that many individuals, including editors, will continue to do as they like in the matter. Even some who normally try to follow the rules (and recommendations) to the letter would, one feels unhappily confident, as a last resort outlaw themselves in this particular respect. And the living die-hards of whatever breed may be expected to have their progeny, though in ever decreasing numbers as the effect of a practicable recommendation becomes more and more widely felt.

This recommendation is the one voted in 1950 at the Seventh International Botanical Congress at Stockholm, which the present writer understands is to have the wording of his proposal as earlier published independently *), namely that *"All specific and trivial names or epithets should be written with a small initial letter, although writers especially desiring to use capital initial letters for particular names or epithets may do so when these are directly derived from the names of persons (whether actual or mythical), or are vernacular (or barbaric) names, or are previously published (including pre-Linnaean and invalid) unmodified generic names."* This proposal was designed (a) to give recognition to the recent swing toward decapitalization for which there are many practical reasons as well as weighty arguments, (b) to clarify and add precision to the former wording which was ambiguous and did not mention some instances that were presumably meant to be included, while (c) allowing those who still wished to do so to capitalize specific and trivial epithets in certain specified categories. Such a compromise seemed the best way to get out of an awkward dilemma, and in the opinion of many has done so. Altogether it would seem unnecessary, and indeed highly undesirable, to reopen this sore subject yet again.

The writer expresses his opinion not as an hereditary opponent to capitalization — indeed he was brought up and long nurtured in the classical Oxford and Harvard traditions which strongly supported it — but as one who has suffered perennially, especially in editorial work, from the loss of time and patience in trying to maintain it, with frequent exasperation or even complete frustration on coming to a dead end where it seemed

*) "Specific and trivial decapitalization": *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club*, **77**: 214—221, 1950.

impossible to determine what to do in a particular instance. Such an *impasse* may be reached in even the best of libraries, as for instance in determining whether a particular name is actually a vernacular one, and whether in a particular case a personal or (identical) place-name is involved; and indeed the writer would be inclined to advocate resumption of capitalization of place-names if he felt able to do so for personal ones. Most of the capitalization pros and cons, with examples and references to other opinions and treatments, are given in the paper already cited (of which reprints can be sent on request).

As a recent, undignified instance of an attempt to settle this unworthy controversy, onze recalls the efforts of the Nomenclature Section of the Stockholm Congress. When the issue came up in due course *) it was fully debated and, if memory serves aright, the first of the seven published proposals, that "Specific and subspecific epithets should be written with a small initial letter", was carried by a substantial majority. But then after the end of the final session, when the presiding officer had pronounced the sittings closed until the next congress several years hence, and delegates and members were filing out, a rumpus was raised near the back of the hall and some loud shouts were heard for a fresh vote on, of all things, this issue of decapitalization! To the dismay of those accustomed to order and protocol, this was allowed after some wrangling, and following further heated debate a majority of those remaining voted for the compromise proposal (no. 6) *), which was to be emended as worded above. Although this happened to be the writer's own proposal, toward which he had spent much time and effort, he felt in honour bound at the time to speak and vote for the resolution previously passed by a proper representation of the Nomenclature Section at an official session, in condemnation of this unparliamentary procedure and attempted pressurization by a noisy minority. Now, however, he feels justified in returning to his earlier suggestion; and so his counter-proposal to that made in TAXON, if the matter *has* to be brought up again at the forthcoming Paris congress, would be for proper confirmation, by the Nomenclature Section at an official session, of his compromise recommendation already quoted above and now incorporated in the new edition of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature.

Two morals emerge from these considerations: the first is that, in future, no loophole should be allowed for vocal minorities to impose their will on voting sections by demanding votes 'out of hours'. The second, bearing in mind on one hand the heavy preliminaries and gruelling extra sessions of the Nomenclature Section and Committees at Stockholm, and, on the other, the paramount desirability of stability in the Rules, is that proposals for modification thereof should henceforth have to be seconded, before publication or at least before full consideration, by some recognized and responsible authority — such as a member of a sufficiently diverse panel of the I.A.P.T.

*) "Synopsis of proposals concerning the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature submitted to the Seventh International Botanical Congress — Stockholm 1950" prepared by J. Lanjouw, published for the International Commission of Taxonomy of the I.U.B.S. *Utrecht:* Oosthoek, pp. 206—8, 1950.

TERCER SYMPOSIUM DE FARMACOBOTANICA AMERICANA

La Habana, Cuba, Diciembre 1953

Al finalizar el Segundo Symposium de Farmacobotánica Americana, que se celebró en Lima auspiciado por la Universidad Mayor de San Marcos, con la colaboración de la UNESCO, como una deferencia a Cuba, se sugirió que fuera La Habana la sede del tercero de estos eventos científicos, a cuyo efecto se confió al Dr Antonio Ponce de León que asistía representando a Cuba en este concurso, la misión de llevar a su país tan grata sugerencia.

Después de un cambio de impresiones con el senor Rector de la Universidad de la Habana y otras distinguidas personalidades, convocó el Dr Ponce de León, a través del Colegio Farmacéutico Nacional y de la Sociedad Cubana de Botánica, a los farmacéuticos y botánicos cubanos para que, en asamblea soberana, decidieran sobre la mencionada invitación.

Los acuerdos tomados en esta asamblea pueden sintetizarse en la forma siguiente:

1. Aceptar, por aclamación, la sugerencia de que La Habana sea la sede del Tercer Symposium de Farmacobotánica Americana, invitación que constituye una muy honrosa distinción que se le ha hecho a Cuba.
2. Que se considere a la Universidad de La Habana como la Institutión auspiciadora de este evento científico.
3. Que se tenga en cuenta la valiosa cooperación de la UNESCO, que tan eficaz había sido en los dos concursos similares celebrados anteriormente.
4. Que se tome en consideración la labor que pudieran realizar diversas instituciones nacionales en su doble deber, como hijas de la misma Alma Máter y como centros científicos cubanos.
5. Que se procediera a la designación del Comité encargado de la organización del Symposium, o que se llevó a cabo por elección.

LA UNIVERSIDAD DE LA HABANA

Interpretando la elevada misión que corresponde a la Universidad de la Habana en relación con la investigación científica y el progreso de la Ciencia, su ilustre Rector Dr Inclán, desde le primer momento, dió todas las facilidades al Comité Organizador para su actuación. Luego, el Consejo Universitario tomó por unanimidad el acuerdo de que esa bicentenaria institución fuera la auspiciadora oficial del Tercer Symposium de Farmacobotánica Americana.

LA UNESCO

El Dr Angel Establier, Jefe del Centro de Cooperación Científica de la UNESCO para la América Latina, en visita que hizo a La Habana, reiteró su ofrecimiento de que la institución que representa prestaría su valiosa cooperación a éste Tercer Symposium, como lo había hecho con los anteriores.

LAS INSTITUCIONES CIENTIFICAS CUBANAS

Han manifestado ya sus deseos de colaborar en el Tercer Symposium de Farmacobotánica Americana instituciones, tan prestigiosas como la Academia de Farmacia de Cuba, el Colegio Farmacéutico Nacional, la Academia de Ciencias Médicas, Físicas y Naturales de la Habana, la Sociedad Cubana de Botánica, el Instituto Nacional de Higiene, Círcula de Investigaciones Farmaceuticas y el Colegio Nacional de Doctores en Ciencias y en Filosofía y Letras.

COMITE ORGANIZADOR — Jardin Botanico de la Universidad de la Habana, Carlos III e Infanta, Habana, Cuba.

Miembros de Honor: Dr Clemente Inclán y Costa: Rector Magnífico de la Universidad de La Habana; Dr Angel Establier: Jefe del Centro de Cooperación Científica de la UNESCO para la América Latina; Dr José Capote Díaz: Decano de la Facultad de Farmacia y presidente de la Academia de Farmacia de Cuba; Dr Juan Ibáñez Gómez: Presidente del Primer Symposium de Farmacobotánica Americana, que tuvo efecto en Santiago de Chile; Dr Julio López Guillén: Presidente del Segundo Symposium de Farmacobotánica Americana, que tuvo lugar en Lima; Dr Horacio R. Descole: Director del Instituto "Miguel Lillo" y ex rector de la Universidad de Tucumán, Argentina; Dr Francisco de la Carrera: Decano de la Facultad de Ciencias de la Universidad de la Habana; Dr José A Presno Bastion: Presidente de la Academia de Ciencias de la Habana; Dr Arturo M. Castro Valera: Presidente del Colegio Farmacéutico de Cuba; Dr Juan Tomás Roig: Botánico de la Estación Experimental Agronómica de Cuba.

Comite Ejecutivo: Presidente: Dr Antonio Ponce de León y Aymé; Vicepresidente: Dr Raúl Romero Jordán; Secretario: Dr Jorge A. Dominicis Santiesteban; Vicesecretario: Dr Alfredo Carabot; Tesorero: Dra M. A. Mesa de Ponce; Vicetesorero: Dr M. V. Martín; Vocales: Dr Enrique Unanue, Dr Antonio Caparó, Dr Faustino Pérez Díaz, Dra Concepción Valdées Cremé, Dr Francisco Hidalgo, Dra. Mercedes Mayo, Dr Eduardo Palacios Planas, Dr Héctor Zayas-Bazán, Dra Luisa Sánchez Borges, Dr Manuel Flores Hernández, Dr Angel Pérez André y Dr Humberto Jardines Carrión.

TEMARIO

Podemos deducir por el temario en el primer boletin del tercer Symposium (Octobre 1952) son finalidades de estas reuniones intensificar el estudio de las plantas medicinales americanas y orientar la enseñanza de la Botánica en sus relaciones con la Farmacia. A estos efectos se incita al establecimiento de laboratorios fitofarmacoquímicos, al mantenimiento de secciones de plantas medicinales en los jardines botánicos, así como al establecimientos de herbarios y de museos Fitofarmacognosicos, en algunos de los cuales pueda existir toda la Fitofarmacoteca americana.

RAPID CHROMOSOME METHODS FOR THE TAXONOMIST

by

HAMILTON P. TRAUB (Arcadia, California)

1951a; 1953b), have not given permanent preparations in the writer's experience (Traub, 1953a; 1953b). The use of aceto-carmine in such combinations has solved the problem as will be indicated below.

The secondary non-volatile ingredient consists of 10% sorbitol, or sorbitol syrup, Arlex. The solvent is 45% acetic acid saturated with carmine (Schneider, 1880). Mordanting may be by the addition of a trace of iron as first recommended by Belling (1926), or by adding other suitable metal ions such as bismuth, gold, etc., to Schneider's aceto-carmine. Mordanting may also be accomplished by selecting a suitable metal arabinate such as sodium bismuth arabinate, potassium antimony arabinate, gold arabinate, etc. Preparations made with these mountants have now been observed for more than two years and are still satisfactory for use in photomicrography (Traub, 1953a; 1953b). The mounting procedure is similar to the well known aceto-carmine method but the mounts are permanent. It is therefore un-necessary to make permanent the temporary aceto-carmine mounts prepared by the old procedure (McClintock, 1929).

Literature cited

I. The series of papers on the mountants discussed has been submitted for publication to Euclides (devoted to pure and applied sciences; address: Matires Conceptionistas 17, Madrid, España.). Publication will begin early in 1953. The list of titles follows:

TRAUB, HAMILTON P. Arabinic acid, a new non-precipitating ingredient in combined staining and mounting media. (To be published in Euclides, 1953a).

TRAUB, HAMILTON P. Pure arabinates as the chief non-volatile ingredients in combined staining and mounting media. (To be published in Euclides, 1953b).

TRAUB, HAMILTON P. Acenaphthene in 0.5% ethanol-water solution as a chromosome shortener. (To be published in Euclides, 1953c).

TRAUB, HAMILTON P. Measured application of heat in relation to combined staining and mounting media. (To be published in Euclides, 1953d).

Although it is highly desirable for the taxonomist to examine whenever possible the chromosome complement of the living material he classifies, this has not as a rule been practicable because suitable rapid methods for making direct permanent chromosome mounts have not been available. Progress in classification has lagged in cases where chromosome studies were not available as shown in a recent monograph on one of the tribes of the *Amaryllidaceae* (Traub & Moldenke, 1949). It is hoped that it is agreed that the stage has been passed when the taxonomist relied solely on the gross morphological characters for his taxonomic distinctions, although these are still and will remain the most important criteria in a great many cases.

The rapid aceto-carmine methods for temporary chromosome mounts are of course available but when these are used the mounts must be made permanent later (McClintock, 1929). In connection with his taxonomic work on the *Amaryllidaceae*, and other plant science experiments, the writer has developed rapid methods for making direct permanent aceto-carmine chromosome mounts of root-tip and other plant meristems for chromosome studies (Traub, 1951a; 1951b; 1953a; 1953b; 1953c; 1953d). These rapid methods have been found satisfactory in his work. Since other taxonomists have similar needs, and may be interested in using such methods, the bases of these methods are briefly indicated, and this is followed by a listing of the titles in the series of papers and place where they will be published.

The methods are based on the use of arabinic acid (Traub, 1953a) and the metal arabinates (Traub, 1951a) which are used in 10% concentration as the chief non-volatile ingredients. As far as is known, arabinic acid has not been previously used for this purpose. More than fifty new metal arabinates have been manufactured for the first time for use in these experiments (Traub, 1951a; Traub & Smith, 1953e). Gum arabic, consisting chiefly of calcium and magnesium arabinates, has been suggested by Zirkle (1940) for use in combination with formo-carmine (Pianese, 1892; 1894), but after more than two years' trial this combination, and also similar combinations with the pure arabinates (Traub,

II. The following paper is in preparation and will be published later:

Traub, Hamilton P. and Fred Smith. Preparation of metal arabinates and some of their properties. (In preparation, 1953e).

III. Published papers .

McClintock, B. A method for making acetocarmine smears permanent. Stain. Tech. **4**: 53—56. 1929.

Pianese, G. I nervi le reti e le terminagiones nervose del pericardio e il dolores nella pericardite. Gio. Intem. Sci. Med. Napoli. **14**: 881—894. 1892; Zeit wiss. mik. **10(4)**: 501—503. 1894. (abstract).

Traub, Hamilton P. Pure arabinates as ingredients in direct stain-mountants. Plant Life **7**: 155—157. 1951a.

Traub, Hamilton P. Colchicine-induced *Hemerocallis* polyploids and their breeding behavior. Plant Life **7**: 83—116. 1951b.

Traub, Hamilton P. and Harold N. Moldenke. *Amaryllidaceae:* Tribe *Amarylleae*. 1949.

Zirkle, Conway. Combined fixing, staining and mounting media. Stain. Tech. **15**: 139—151. 1940.

Special Committee for Fungi

Disposition of Nomina Generica Conservanda for Fungi

The Special Committee for Fungi adopted at the VII International Botanical Congress at Stockholm five resolutions concerning nomina generica conservanda proposita:

I. That every proposal for conservation not "accompanied by a detailed statement of the cases for and against.... conservation" (Art. 21, Note 1, of the 3rd edition of the Rules; Art. 24, Note 1, of the new Code) nor having such a statement supplied by a later student, is to be rejected, to be reinstated as a subject for consideration by the Committee only after such a statement is supplied.

The list of proposals so rejected need not be set forth here. It may be that proposals with such statements have escaped the attention of the Committee; if so, these are subject to later action. It is here implied, however, that all proposals submitted before July 1, 1950, and not referred to in succeeding paragraphs are automatically rejected under this first resolution.

II. That every proposal for conservation of a name that would be retained without conservation against the nomina rejicienda proposita is to be rejected.

The following proposals are automatically rejected under this second resolution:

Agaricus vs. Psalliota & Pratella; *Auricularia* vs. Auricularia & Laschia; *Calocera* vs. Corynoides; *Clitopilus* vs. Pleuropus; *Collybia* vs. Gymnopus; *Cordyceps* vs. Cordiceps; *Cystopus* vs. Cystopus; *Cyttaria* vs. Cyttarium; *Flammula* vs. Flammula, Gymnopilus, Gymnocybe, Flammopsis, Ryssospora, & Visculus; *Gomphus* vs. Gomphora; *Guepiniopsis* vs. Guepinia; *Guignardia* vs. Carlia; *Gymnosporangium* vs. Puccinina, Aecidium, & Roestelia; *Hericium* vs. Hericium; *Hexagona* vs. Scenidium; *Hydnum* vs. Dentinum; *Hydrocybe* vs. Leucopus; *Hymenochaete* vs. Stereum; *Hymenogramme* vs. Aschersonia, Junghuhnia, & Laschia; *Hypomyces* vs. Hypolyssus; *Marssonina* vs. Marsonia & Marssonia; *Melampsora* vs. Uredo; *Nidularia* vs. Granularia; *Octaviania* vs. Octavianina; *Olpidiopsis* vs. Pleocystidium & Diplophysa; *Omphalina* vs. Perona; *Panus* vs. Rhipidium; *Paxillus* vs. Rhymovis & Ruthea; *Peziza* vs. Aleuria; *Phallus* vs. Ithyphallus; *Phellinus* vs. Poria; *Pholiota* vs. Derminus; *Phoma* vs. Sphaeropsis; *Pisomyxa* vs. Bryocladium; *Plowrightia* vs. Dothidella; *Podoscypha* vs. Craterella; *Poria* vs. Poria & Physisporus; *Porodisculus* vs. Enslinia; *Pseudolpidium* vs. Olpidiopsis; *Pterula* vs. Pterula; *Puccinia* vs. Puccinia & Puccinia; *Secotium* vs. Endoptychum; *Sphaeropsis* vs. Macroplodia; *Stereum* vs. Auricularia & Stereum; *Telamonia* vs. Raphanazon; *Tomentella* vs. Hypochnus; *Tremella* vs. Tremella & Gyraria; *Trichosporium* vs. Alytosporium; *Venturia* vs. Endostigme; *Volvaria* vs. Pseudofarinaceus; *Xerocomus* vs. Versipellis.

III. That every proposal for conservation of a name that is a later homonym of a name in current use for a genus in another group is to be rejected; and that consultation is to be immediately undertaken with the appropriate Special Committees concerning all other names that are later homonyms of names in other groups.

The following proposals are automatically rejected under this third resolution:

Galera vs. Galera; *Psathyra* vs. Psathyra; *Sphaerella* vs. Sphaerella & Mycosphaerella.

IV. That a number of names proposed for conservation and about which there seems

to be little difference of opinion are to be conserved, such action to be automatically rescinded if their present status is altered by action of the Stockholm Congress on the Rules. These names are published in the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature pp. 76—78. 1952. The following corrections in that published list should be noted:

p. 76, right column, last line: for "1823" read "1822".

p. 77, right column, l. 19: after "1843" add "T.: idem".

p. 78, right column, l. 2: for "**1** : 6" read "**1** : 7".

p. 77, right column, l. 47, 48: for "Schw. ex Fr.", etc., read "Schw., Naturf. Ges. Leipzig Schr. **1**: 108. 1822".

p. 78, left column, l. 2, 3: for "Pers. ex Fr.", etc., read "Pers., Mycol. Eur. **1**: 141. 1822".

p. 78, left column, l. 4, 5 and l. 6, 7: for "Tode ex Fr.", etc., read "Pers. ex Hook., Fl. Scot. **2**: 9. 1821".

Of these the first three are typographical errors, and the last three are results of the application of the new Art. 22f. None have any nomenclatorial consequences.

V. That as soon as the Rules as amended by the Stockholm Congress are available, all proposals for conservation not adopted or rejected under the foregoing paragraphs [*I—IV*] are to be referred to the members of the Committee for a vote, and that six months after the date of mailing of blank ballots the votes returned are to be recorded and the decisions of the Committee published.

By a written vote, completed in February, 1952, the Committee adopted the following resolution:

The assent of 3/5 of the members voting shall be necessary for the adoption of any proposal for conservation.

By the same written ballot the following proposals for conservation were adopted:

Nomina conservanda	**Nomina rejicienda**
Amanitopsis Roze, Soc. Bot. France Bul. **23**: 50. 1876. — T.: *Agaricus vaginatus* Bull. ex Fr., Syst. Mycol. **1**: 14. 1821.	*Vaginata* Nees ex Gray, Nat. Arr. **1**: 601. 1821. — T.: *V. livida* Gray, l.c.
Amphisphaeria Ces. & Not., Soc. Crittogam. Ital. Comm. **1**: 223. 1863. — T.: *Sphaeropsis conica* Lév. in Demidoff, Voy. Russ. **2**: 112. 1842.	*Sphaeropsis* Lév., l.c. — T.: idem.
Aschersonia Mont., Ann. Sci. Nat. Bot. iii. **10**: 121. 1848. — T.: *A. taitense* Mont., l.c. p. 122.	*Aschersonia* Endl., Gen. Pl. Suppl. **2**: 103. 1842. — T.: *Laschia crustacea* Jungh., Batav. Gen. Kunst. Wetensch. Verh. 17 Deel, III Stuck: 75. 1838.
Candida Berkh., De schimmelgesl. Monilia 41. 1923. — T.: *C. vulgaris* Berkh., l.c. p. 42.	*Syringospora* Quinq., Arch. Physiol. Norm. Path. **1**: 293. 1868. — T.: *Oidium albicans* Rob., Hist. Nat. Veg. Paras. 502. 1853. *Parendomyces* Queyr. & Lar., Soc. Méd. Hôp. Paris Bull. Mem. iii **28**: 136. 1909. — T.: *P. albus* Queyr. & Lar., l.c. *Parasaccharomyces* Beurm. & Gong., Trib. Méd. **42**: 502. 1909 [? Nomen provisorium. Cf. op. cit. p. 518]. — T.: deest; sed conf. pp. 521, 524 *"P. Sambergeri"* (nom. nud.). *Pseudomonilia* Geiger, Centralbl. Bakt. 134. 1910. — T.: *P. albomarginata* Geig., l.c. p. 135.
Coniothyrium Corda, Icon. Fung. **4**: 38. 1840. — T.: *C. palmarum* Corda, l.c.	*Clisosporium* Fr., Syst. Mycol. **3**: 334. 1832. — T.: *Cl. lignorum* Fr., l.c. p. 335.
Conocybe Fayod, Ann. Sci. Nat. Bot. vii **9**: 357. 1889. — T.: *Agaricus tener* Schaeff. ex Fr., Syst. Mycol. **1**: 265. 1821.	*Raddetes* Karst., Hedwigia **26**: 112. 1887. — T.: *R. turkestanicus* Karst. l.c. *Pholiotina* Fayod, l.c. p. 359. — T.: *A. blattarius* Fr., l.c. p. 246. *Pholiotella* Speg., Acad. Sci. Cordoba Bol. **11**: 412. 1889. — T.: *Pholiotella blattariopsis* Speg., l.c.

Gautieria Vitt., Monogr. Tuber. 25. 1831. — T.: *G. morchellaeformis* Vitt., l.c.

Gyromitra Fr., Summ. Veg. Scand. 346. 1849. — T.: *Helvella esculenta* Pers., Mycol. Eur. **1**: 212. 1822.

Mutinus Fr. Summ. Veg. Scand. 434. 1849. — T.: *Phallus caninus* Pers. Syn. Meth. Fung. 245. 1801.

Mycobonia Pat., Soc. Mycol. Fr. Bul. **10**: 76. 1894. — T.: *Peziza flava* Swartz ex Fr., Syst. Mycol. **2**: 161. 1822.

Panaeolus (Fr.) Quél., Soc. Émul. Montbeliard Mém. ii **5**: 151. 1872. — T.: *Agaricus papilionaceus* Bull. ex Fr., Syst. Mycol. **1**: 301. 1821, emend. Fr., Epicr. 236. 1838.

Phoma Sacc., Michelia **2**: 4. 1880. — T.: *P. herbarum* Westend. ex Sacc., Syll. Fung. **3**: 133. 1884.

Pseudographis Nyl., Soc. Sci. Nat. Cherbourg Mém. **3**: 190. 1855. — T.: *Hysterium elatinum* (Ach.) Pers. ex Fr., Syst. Mycol. **2**: 584. 1823

Rhabdospora (Dur. & Mont. ex Sacc.) Sacc., Syll. Fung. **3**: 578. 1884. — T.: *Septoria oleandri* Dur. & Mont., Expl. Sci. Alger. **1**: 593. 1849.

Rhipidium Cornu, Soc. Bot. Fr. Bul. **18**: 58. 1871. — T.: *R. interruptum* Cornu, l.c.

Urocystis Rabenh. ex Fuckel, Nass. Ver. Naturk. Jahrb. **23—24**: 41. [1870]. — T.: *Erysibe occulta* Wallr., Fl. Crypt. Germ **2**: 212. 1833.

Gautiera Raf., Med. Fl. **1**: 202. 1828. — T.: *Gaultheria procumbens* L., Sp. Pl. **1**: 395. 1753.

Gyrocephalus Pers., Soc. Linn. Paris Mém. **3**: 77. 1824. — T.: *H. sinuosa* Brond., Soc. Linn. Paris Mém. **3**: [74]. 1824.

Aedycia Raf., Jour. Bot. Soc. Bot. [Desvaux] **1**: 222. 1808. — T.: *A. rubra* Raf., l.c.

Ithyphallus Gray, Nat. Arr. **1**: 675. 1821. — T.: *P. caninus*.

Cynophallus (Fr.) Corda, Icon. Fung. **5**: 29. 1842. — T.: *P. caninus*.

Hirneola Fr., Syst. Orb. Veg. 93. 1825. — T.: idem.

Coprinarius (Fr.) Kummer, Führer Pilzk. 20. 1871. — T.: idem.

Phoma Fr. ex Fr., Syst. Mycol. **2**: 546. 1823. — T.: *P. pustula* (Pers.) ex Fr., l.c. p. 547.

Krempelhuberia Massal., Geneac. Lichen. 34. 1854. — T.: *K cadubriae* Massal., l.c. p. 15.

Filaspora Preuss, Linnaea **26**: 718. [1855]. — T.: *F. peritheciaeformis* Preuss, l.c.

Rhipidium Wallr., Fl. Crypt. Germ. **2**: 742. 1833. — T.: *Agaricus stipticus* Bull. ex Fr., Syst. Mycol. **1**: 188. 1821.

Polycystis Lév., Ann. Sci. Nat. Bot. iii **5**: 269. 1846. — T.: *Caeoma pompholygodes* Schlecht., Linnaea **1**: 248. 1826.

Tuburcinia Fr., Syst. Mycol. **3**: 439. 1832. — T.: *Rhizoctonia orobanches* Mérat, Nouv. Fl. Paris 2 ed. **1**: 135. 1821.

By the same written ballot the following proposals were rejected:

Acrotheca vs. Gomphinaria; *Acrothecium* vs. Cordana & Cacumisporium; *Aposphaeria* vs. Aposphaeria & Coniothyrium; *Barya* vs. Barya; *Calodon* vs. Hydnellum; *Capnodium* vs. Fumago, Apiosporium, & Polychaeton; *Cladoderris* vs. Cymatoderma; *Clitopilus* vs. Pleuropus; *Coniosporium* vs. Coniosporium; *Coniothyrium* vs. Clisosporium & Coniothyrium; *Corticium* vs. Phlebia, Corticium, Ricnophora, Athelia, & Hyphoderma; *Cortinarius* vs. Cortinaria; *Craterellus* vs. Craterella; *Diehaena* vs. Heterographa; *Dictyolus* vs. Leptoglossum & Leptotus; *Empusa* vs. Empusa; *Guepinia* vs. Gyrocephalus & Phlogiotis; *Guepinia* vs. Guepinia; *Hendersonia* vs. Sporocadus & Hendersonia; *Hirneola* vs. Hirneola & Laschia; *Hymenochaete* vs. Hymenochaete; *Hymenula* vs. Hymenella; *Hypochnus* vs. Lyomyces; *Hypolyssus* vs. Caripia; *Hypospila* vs. Phoma; *Lachnocladium* vs. Eriocladus; *Macowanites* vs. Macowania & Hypochanum; *Massaria* vs. Splanchnonema; *Mastomyces* vs. Topospora; *Monilia* vs. Monilia; *Monotospora* vs. Monotospora; *Montagnites* vs. Montagnea; *Mutinus* vs. Aedycia; *Mycoleptodon* vs. Odontia; *Mytilidion* vs. Mytilinidion; *Nummularia* vs. Biscogniauxia, Nummularia, & Numularia; *Ophiostoma* vs. Endoconidiophora; *Pactilia* vs.

Achitonium & Leucosporium; *Peniophora* vs. Corticium & Hyphoderma; *Phleospora* vs. Septoria; *Phlyctidium* vs. Phlyctidium; *Pilacre* vs. Phleogena; *Polystictus* vs. Coltricia & Strilia; *Ramaria* vs. Ramaria & Cladaria; *Ramularia* vs. Ramularia & Cylindrospora; *Rhabdospora* vs. Filaspora; *Panellus* vs. Rhipidium; *Rhodophyllus* vs. Acurtis, Entoloma, Leptonia, Nolanea, Eccilia, & Claudopus; *Septoria* vs. Septoria; *Sordaria* vs. Schizothecium, Enterobotryum, Podospora, Malinvernia, & Pleurage; *Spegazzinula* vs. Dubitatio; *Sphaeropsis* vs. Macroplodia & Sphaeropsis; *Stigmatea* vs. Ascospora; *Stigmea* vs. Ascospora; *Teichospora* vs. Strickeria & Sphaeria; *Thyrsidium* vs. Cheirospora, Hyperomyxa, & Myriocephalum; *Trematostoma* vs. Clypeothecium; *Tremellodon* vs. Pseudohydnum & Hydnogloea; *Trichosporium* vs. Colletosporium & Alytosporium; *Tromera* vs. Biatorella & Sarea; *Volvaria* vs. Volvaria.

The vote on the several proposals to conserve *Tricholoma* was inconclusive, and another vote is being taken.

It should be noted that the lists of rejected proposals are made up of abbreviated entries. In different proposals different types may have been considered for a single genus, and the nn. rejic. prop. may have been distributed among several separate proposals.

It should also be noted that the proposals approved by the written vote of the Committee are not thereby finally adopted. They are now submitted to the Advisory Board and the General Committee of Botanical Nomenclature (cf. Taxon **1**: 95) whose action will be reported in Taxon; if favorable action is received, they are tentatively adopted, and the conserved names may be retained "pending the decision of the next International Botanical Congress" (Int. Rules, 3 ed., Art. 22; Code, Art. 25). As a matter of practice, there seems no reason to anticipate the subsequent rejection of any of these proposals; all those known to conflict with names used in groups other than the Fungi have already been submitted (under the Committee's Resolution III) to the secretaries of the appropriate special committees.

Copies of new proposals for conservation of generic names of Fungi (with correct citation of names of genera and of types, and with arguments for and against conservation) should be sent to Prof. J. Lanjouw, Secretary, General Committee of Botanical Nomenclature, Lange Nieuwstraat 106, Utrecht, Netherlands, and to the undersigned. To facilitate study and discussion before the 1954 Congress by those interested, authors are urged to publish such new proposals before September, 1953 *).

Donald P. Rogers
Secretary, Special Committee for Fungi

The New York Botanical Garden
Bronx Park, New York 58, N.Y., U.S.A.

*) All proposals can be published or republished in Taxon (J. L.).

INDEX HERBARIORUM

In the year since the publication of Part I, "The Herbaria of the World" of the Index Herbariorum, we received letters of appreciation next to critical remarks. The latter did not concern the main part of the book, but especially the Chapters IV, Geographical Specialization, V Specialists, and VII Collectors. In particular we owe a constructive criticism to our colleagues of the Rijksherbarium at Leiden, Dr H. J. Lam, Dr S. J. van Ooststroom and Dr C. G. G. J. van Steenis. These chapters were merely meant as a special Index to various groups of persons and activities mentioned in the main list of Herbaria. We quite agree that the way in which the lists are given — copied from the facts given in the answers to our questionnaire — can easily lead to confusion for a not particularly careful reader. In order to draw up e.g. a reliable list of specialists (which could be of great value to all of us) a more critical and extensive study would have to be made. Nevertheless, the main part of the Index Herbariorum was well received and has proved to be of value for taxonomists and taxonomical Institutes. Many additional data have poured in. As the present edition is nearly exhausted we plan to prepare a new revised one which will be distributed against an extremely low price (or even free for regular members). The lists of the above-mentioned chapters will be omitted. According to a suggestion by Dr van Steenis all these names will be inserted in a general index at the end of the book.

In the course of this year we will start also the publication of Part II of the Index Herbariorum, the list of Collectors. This part will be published in instalments as already stated in our introduction to Part I.

Finally we wish to emphasize again that completeness will never be attained for this work and that even mistakes are inevitable. One should not judge such a work in first instance after its shortcomings, but according to its existence as compared with the situation when no such book was available. This does not mean that we want to anticipate criticism: we shall gladly receive any constructive remarks for these are indispensable to attain a certain perfection of our work.

INTERNATIONAL CODE OF BOTANICAL NOMENCLATURE

Example of a proposal

Botanists preparing proposals concerning the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature are earnestly requested to give them the form of the following *example*. This example contains a proposal made to and accepted by the Stockholm Congress. The textual and numerical references bear upon the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature, ed. 3.

Article 27

Delete "or more" and insert after "joined by hyphens" the following: "Epithets not so joined when originally published are not to be rejected but when used must be hyphenated [See also Art. 68 (4)]".

Argument: This will remove all doubt as to procedure to be followed in such cases. Furthermore, it will illegalize polynomials. As the rule is worded at present polynomials are valid if joined by hyphens and it is not clear if only Linnean names can be accepted if consisting of more than one word not joined originally by hyphens, or if subsequent ones can be accepted .

Proposed by: F. R. Fosberg.

Original publication: Brittonia **7**: 16. 1949.

* * *

Remark: All proposals can be published or republished in "Taxon". Botanists who already published proposals of any category (concerning the Code itself or concerning *nomina conservanda)* are requested to send reprints to the Rapporteur-Général and to draft a short version for inclusion in Taxon. Those publishing proposals concerning *nomina conservanda* should draft these proposals in accordance with the proposal no. 3 (Peltandra vs. Houttinia) printed below. The "Regulations for the selection of Generic names for conservation" published by T. A. Sprague and F. R. Fosberg in Taxon **1**: 14—15. 1951 should be taken into consideration.

Proposals to the Paris Congress

Proposal no. 3

Proposal for the conservation of the genus *Peltandra* of the *Araceae:* 747. **Peltandra** Rafinesque, Jour. Phys. Chem. Hist. Nat. & Artes **89**: 103. 1819 *versus: Houttinia* Necker, Elementa Botanica **3**: 291. 1790.

Peltandra Raf. *Araceae*

Adopted by: Endl., Gen. Pl. 237 (1837); Bentham & Hooker, Gen. Pl. **3**: 975 (1883); Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pfl.-fam. 2 (3): 136 (1889); Dalla Torre & Harms, Gen. Siph. 48 (1900—07); Schott, Syn. Aroid. 50 (1856), — Gen. Aroid. *t. 41* (1858), — Prod. Aroid. 157 (1860); Engler, Pflanzenreich **64**: 72 (1915); Gray, Man. Bot. N.U.S. 446 (1848); Britton, Man. Fl. N. St. **1**: 230 (1901); Small, Fl. S.E.U.S. 227 (1903); Britton & Brown, Ill. Fl. N. St. **1**: 443 (1913); Fernald, Gray's Man. Bot. ed. 8. 383 (1950). *Three* species in E.N. Amer.

Type species: *P. undulata* Raf. (l.c.) a synonym of *P. virginica* (L.) Kunth which is based on *Arum virginicum* L.

Houttinia Neck. Araceae

Adopted by no one.

Typus deest.

Argument: Though *Houttinia* has been included in synonymy under Calla by Index Kewensis, Dalla Torre & Harms and by Engler, Necker separated his genus from *Calla* by the fact that the flowers were imperfect and the male and female flowers were separated from one another and by the fact that the "discus" was "digitiform". I interpret the last to refer to the lower part of the spathe which in *Peltandra* could be called digitiform. The flowers of *Calla* are always perfect whereas those of *Peltandra* never are. No species has ever been described for *Houttinia.*

Proposed by: Donald G. Huttleston, Brooklyn.

Amaranthus & Amarantus

On page 44 (Art. 82, Examples 2nd and 3rd lines) of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature it is stated that in 1753, and consistently thereafter Linnaeus spelled the name as *Amarantus* and that it must not be altered to *Amaranthus*. That statement is erroneous; the sentence should read:

"The generic name *Mesembryanthemum* L. (1753) and *Amaranthus* L. (1753) were deliberately so spelt by Linnaeus and the spelling must not be altered to *Mesembrianthemum* and *Amarantus* respectively, although these latter forms are philologically preferable."

The french translation of the Code (p. 193) and the third edition of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature (p. 22) give the correct situation.

Dates de publication

M. R. DE LITARDIÈRE (Grenoble) nous envoie au sujet de la date de publication de divers genres d'Apocynacées et Asclépiadacées la note suivante.

Le Code International de Nomenclature Botanique adoptée par le Septième Congrès International mentionne, dans la liste des *Nomina generica conservanda* (p. 128, 129), la date de 1809 pour la publication des genres suivants appartenant à la famille des Apocynacées: *Alstonia* R. Br., *Ichnocarpus* R. Br., *Parsonia* R. Br., *Prestonia* R. Br. et à celle des Asclépiadacées: *Oxypetalum* R. Br., *Heurnia* R. Br. Ces genres ont été publiés dans le volume I des *Mem. Wern. Soc.* Nous ferons remarquer qu'OTTO KUNTZE (Jour. Bot. **34**: 306. 1896) a indiqué 1811 comme date de parution du volume précité, publication rare que nous n'avons pu consulter. Nous demandons que les membres du Comité Général de Nomenclature veuillent bien examiner cette question et que la data portée dans le Code soit modifiée si l'indication de KUNTZE est reconnue exacte.

Stockholm Report

The report of the Section Nomenclature of the Seventh International Botanical Congress (by J. LANJOUW, Rapporteur Général) will be published in the Proceedings of the Stockholm Congress. Reprints of this report will be sent (free) to all members of the I.A.P.T. as Volume I of Regnum Vegetabile. The Stockholm Editorial Committee had to await the time that all reports from the Sections were received before printing the Proceedings. This circumstance caused a delay in the publication of this report beyond the date of publication of the Code itself, a delay unforeseen by and outside the powers of the editors of Regnum Vegetabile.

News from the Herbaria

THE YEASTS

A taxonomic study

J. LODDER, Mycologist Koninklijke Nederlandsche Gist- en Spiritusfabriek Delft & N. J. W. KREGER - VAN RIJ, Mycologist Centraal Bureau voor Schimmelcultures, Yeast Division, Delft: The Yeasts, a taxonomic study: North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam 1952. Sole-agency for U.S.A.: Interscience publishers, Inc. New York. pp. 1—713, text figures 1—260.

COCOA COLLECTING EXPEDITION TO COLOMBIA

Prof. R. E. D. BAKER, Mr F. W. COPE and Mr D. J. TAYLOR left Trinidad on 25th June 1952 for Colombia on an expedition to the forests of parts of the drainage basins of the Orinoco and the Amazon in Colombia. The purpose of the expedition is to study wild cacao, and to collect material for future breeding work, and especially for the breeding of better disease-resistant types. The usual means of travel in the forests is by canoe along the rivers. The expedition is expected to last about a year but the members are being relieved at intervals. Dr B. BARTLEY and Mr P. HOLLIDAY left on 6th October to relieve Mr COPE and Prof. BAKER. Mr TAYLOR will not be returning yet.

NEW FLORAS AND ENUMERATIONS

Norsk Flora

JOHANNES LID, Norsk Flora, med teikningar av Dagny Fande Lid, Andre Utgåva. Det Norske Samlaget, Oslo 1952; 771 pag., 389 fig.

Anglo-Egyptian Sudan

F. H. ANDREWS, The Flowering Plants of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. Vol. II: Sterculiaceae-Dipsacaceae. Arbroath-Scotland, October 1952.

Afrique du Nord

RENE MAIRE (†), Flore de l'Afrique du Nord (Maroc, Algérie, Tunisie, Tripolitaine, Cyrénaique et Sahara), publiée par les soins de MARCEL GUINOCHET et LOUIS FAUREL. Paul Lechevalier, éditeur, Paris 1952.

Volume I, Pteridophyta, Gymnospermae, Monocotyledonae: Pandanales, Fluviales, Glumiflorae (Gramineae sf. Panicoideae, sf. Bambusoideae). Avec la collaboration de MARC WEILLER. 366 pp, 209 fig. 1 carte. Illustrations du Dr H. Foley et de Nelly Paté.

REQUESTS

Hoya

Mr Perry Coppens, Flanders Farm, Milford, New Jersey, U.S.A. is composing a collection of Hoya's. He wants to buy living plants of: *H. imperialis* Lindl., *H. multiflora* Blume, *H. globulosa* Hook., *H. fraterna* Blume, *H. purpureo-fusca* Hook., *H. coriacea* Blume, *H. cinnamomifolia* Hook. Mr. Coppens would highly appreciate buying living plants as so far he failed to get seeds obtained to germinate.

PERSONALIA

Dr HAMILTON P. TRAUB, having reached retirement age, retired from service in the Bureau of Plant Industry, U. S. Department of Agriculture on Oct. 31, 1952. In connection with his newly built home at 1531 Rodeo Road, Arcadia, California, where he now resides, he has a modest research laboratory and greenhouse, and he will continue his researches, particularly his biosystematic experiments, the production of artificial mutations in plants, and the taxonomy of the *Amaryllidaceae* to which he has been devoted for most of his life. One of the first projects to be undertaken is the preparation for publication of his taxonomic work, *Amaryllidaceae* (subfamilies, tribes, genera and species), now in manuscript form. He will also continue as research director of the American Plant Life Society, and as editor of "Plant Life", including "Herbertia", the year book devoted to the *Amaryllidaceae*. He invites members of the I.A.P.T. traveling in the neighborhood of his home to stop in for a visit.

Dr R. D. HOOGLAND from Leiden, Netherlands has recently come on the staff of C.S.I.R.O., Land Research and Regional Survey Section (P.O. Box 109) Canberra A.C.T., Australia.

Hemos sufrido la pérdida de uno de los Socios de nuestra Asociación, el Dr JOSÉ CAPOTE DÍAZ, que falleció en La Habana el día 24 del pasado noviembre. El Dr José Capote Díaz era Professor de Bótanica Aplicada y Decano de la Facultad de Farmacia de la Universidad de La Habana. Era uno de los miembros fundadores de la Sociedad Cubana de Botánica, Presidente de la Academia de Farmacia, Miembro de la Academia de Ciencias de La Habana y Socio Correspondiente de la Academia de Farmacia de España. Fué el doctor Capote presidente del Primer Congreso Panamericano de Farmacia, el cual tuvo lugar en La Habana en 1948 y era Miembro de Honor del Comité Ejecutivo del Tercer Symposium de Farmacobotánica Americana.

Dr TAKENOSHIN NAKAI (1882—1952), the director of the National Science Museum and Professor Emeritus of the University of Tokyo, passed away on December 6, 1952. Internationally known, particularly as the authority on Korean flora, he energetically devoted himself to the investigation of East Asiatic plants and the establishment of new classifications in vascular plants until his death. His detailed obituary will appear in a forthcoming number of Botanical Magazine (Tokyo)".

Dr T. G. YUNCKER, Professor of Botany at De Pauw University, will spend several months during 1953 making a botanical exploration trip to the Tongan Islands in the South Pacific where he plans to make as complete a collection of the plants of the islands as time permits.

Prof. ROB. E. FRIES from Stockholm left Sweden for a journey to Central Africa (Kenya and Ruanda-Urundi).

Office

The International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Netherlands.

New Institute Members

Library, University of Natal, P.O. Box 375, Pietermaritzburg, Natal, South Africa.

Membership Fees

Members are requested to pay their membership fees to the regional treasurers.

Members in countries without regional treasurers are requested to make payable their subscriptions to *Messrs Vlaer & Kol, Utrecht, Netherlands,* crossed: *"a.c. International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy".*

A. Individual Persons	$	£	D.fl.	Sw.Kr.
Regular Members	3.—	1.1.—	11.40	15.90
Associate Members	1.—	—.7.—	3.80	5.30
B. Institutes, Societies, etc.				
Supporting Members	50.—	17.10.—	190.—	265.—
Regular Members	25.—	8.15.—	95.—	132.50
Associate Members	10.—	3.10.—	38.—	53.—

Payments can be made in any currency; remittances in other currencies than those listed above are accepted against the exchange rates of the day of payment.

Regnum Vegetabile

Vol. I. *Seventh International Botanical Congress, Section Nomenclature;* report by J. Lanjouw, Rapporteur-Général.

This report has *not yet* been published. The reasons for this delay are mentioned in this issue under *Stockholm Report.*

Vol. II. *Index Herbariorum.* A guide to the location and contents of the World's Public Herbaria, edited by J. Lanjouw Ph. D. *Part 1. The Herbaria of the World,* by J. Lanjouw Ph. D. and F. A. Stafleu Ph. D.; XVI and 167 pages; 16 × 25 cm; 15 February 1952. Details about contents and *prices for members* are given on p. 41 of Taxon no. 3. Price for *non-members:* Dfl. 13.30. Orders can be sent to the *office* of the I.A.P.T.

Vol. III. *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature,* prepared by the Editorial Committee; 228 pages; 16 × 25 cm; 15 October 1952.

Non-Members: Dfl. 14.— (buckram Dfl. 15.90)

Members (Members are entitled to receive *one* copy against a reduced price):

A. Institutes, Societies, etc.	$	£	D.fl.
Supporting and Regular Members (buckram)	—	—	—
Associate Members	2.—	—.14.6	7.60
buckram	2.50	—.18.—	9.50
B. Individual Members			
Regular Members	2.—	—.14.6	7.60
buckram	2.50	—.18.—	9.50
Associate Members	2.80	1.—.—	10.60
buckram	3.30	1. 4.—	12.50
C. Extra copies Members			
stitched	3.70	1. 6.6	14.00
buckram	4.20	1.10.—	15.90

TAXON

Volume I, nos. 1—9, 1951—52. Backnumbers (no. 3 excepted) are available for all members wanting to complete their possibly incomplete copies. Members who joined the I.A.P.T. on or after 1 January 1953 can buy the complete volume I against $ 3.— per copy.

REGIONAL TREASURERS

Austria: Dr K. H. Rechinger, Naturhistorisches Museum, Botanische Abteilung, Burgring 7, Wien.

Belgium: Prof. W. Robyns, Rijksplantentuin, 236 Koninklijke Straat, Brussel.

Canada: Prof. J. Rousseau, Montreal Botanical Garden, 4101 Sherbrooke Street East, Montreal, Que.

Egypt: Mr Mohammed Drar, Fouad I Agricultural Museum, Dokki, Cairo.

Germany: Dr Walter Domke, Staatsinstitut für Allgemeine Botanik, Jungiusstrasse 6, Hamburg 36.

Great Britain and British Overseas Territories: Mr A. A. Bullock, The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, England.

Italy: Prof. R. E. G. Pichi Sermolli, Herbarium Universitatis Florentinae, Istituto Botanico dell'Universitá, Via Lamarmora no. 4, Firenze.

Netherlands: The International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, Lange Nieuwstraat 106, Utrecht. Bankers: Messrs Vlaer & Kol, Utrecht, giro 7247.

Norway: Prof. K. Faegri, Universitet I Bergen, Botanisk Museum, Bergen.

Sweden: Mr Bo Peterson, Botaniska Museet, Lund. Postgiro 43.35.39.

U.S.A.: Dr R. C. Rollins, Gray Herbarium, Harvard University, 79 Garden Street, Cambridge 38, Mass.

"Taxon" is directed by: Prof. J. Lanjouw, Chief Editor, and Dr F. A. Stafleu, Assistant Editor. All correspondence should be sent to the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Netherlands.
All members of I.A.P.T. receive "Taxon" free of charge. Copies of personal members are for private use only and should not be placed in official libraries.